

REMARKS

Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephone interview on January 12, 2005 in which the Examiner clarified the Examiner's response to Applicant's arguments presented in Applicant's August 4, 2004 response. In particular, the Examiner asserted that each node has a bus bridge routing table. Furthermore, the Examiner asserted that the routing table in each node has the EUI of every other node in the topology.

Rejections

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-20

Claims 1-20 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over James, US Pat. No. 6,584,539. Applicant respectfully submits that the final rejection is improper and that James does not anticipate the invention as claimed in claims 1-20.

Improper Final Rejection

In the previous response mailed August 4, 2004, Applicant argued that claims 1, 13 and 18 claim *sending an address resolution protocol (ARP)* that uses the extended unique identifier (EUI) to find an updated nodeID *after* a change indication signal is *received* and that James did not disclose the claimed elements. In addition in the previous response, Applicant argued that claims 7, 11, 16, 17, 19 and 20 claim searching the listener node memory for the *controller EUI* and that James did not disclose the claimed elements. In rebuttal, the Examiner asserted that claims 1, 13 and 18 claims the *change indication signal to find* [sic] an updated nodeID for a listener node using the listener node EUI and that claims 7, 11, 16, 17, 19 and 20 claim searching the listener node memory for *any EUI*. It is clear that neither of the Examiner's assertions is what the Applicant argued, much less what is actually claimed. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is not just misinterpreting the claim language but is actually changing the language in order to find that James anticipates Applicant's

invention as claimed in claims 1, 7, 11, 13 and 16-20. Because the Examiner has failed to directly address either Applicant's arguments or the actual claimed elements, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the finality of the November 15, 2004 Office Action.

James Does Not Anticipate Claims 1-20

In addition, the Examiner asserted in the interview that James teaches each node has a bus bridge routing table containing all the known node EUIs and this anticipates Applicant's claims 7, 11, 16, 17, 19 and 20. However, Applicant respectfully submits that James discloses that bus bridge nodes, and not regular nodes, have bus bridge routing tables. As illustrated in Figure 6 of James, messages are routed through a node that is connected to two different buses, i.e. a bus bridge node. James specifically discloses that routing tables select which messages are accepted for *adjacent bus delivery* by a bus bridge node (James, Col. 6, lines 25-35). Because James only discloses that bus bridge nodes have routing tables, James cannot anticipate Applicant's claims 7, 11, 16, 17, 19 and 20.

Finally, as further evidence that James does not teach or suggest Applicant's invention as claimed, Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to Figures 9 and 10. Claims 1, 13 and 18 correspond to blocks 1001-1003 of Figure 9 and are disclosed in the specification at page 17, lines 1 – 18. Furthermore, claims 7, 11, 16, 17, 19 and 20 correspond to blocks 1101-1105 and 1108 of Figure 10 and are disclosed in the specification at page 18, lines 3 – 27. James contains no similar figures or corresponding disclosure.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention claimed in claims 1-20 is not anticipated by James under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

SUMMARY

Claims 1-20 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant

respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Office Action finality and requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Eric Replogle at (408) 720-8300 x258.


Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR
& ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: Jan. 18, 2005


Eric S. Replogle
Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 52,161

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300 x309